

REMARKS

Document WO 0033187 was cited in an IDS but a copy was inadvertently not provided. A copy is provided for consideration herewith.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claim 4 is rejected as indefinite based on the lack of antecedent basis for the limitation “said relevant dynamic documents”. In response, Applicants amend claim 4 to overcome the rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 17-23 are rejected as anticipated by Koike. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Koike fails to teach every element of the present invention, which is required for a proper anticipation rejection. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Remarks below regarding Koike also apply to the obviousness rejections.

Claims 1, 8, 22, and 23 are independent claims and each recite elements not found in Koike. The dependent claims similarly recite elements not found in Koike, or, in the case of the obviousness rejections, recite elements neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art. Koike fails to generate a summary view of at least one dynamic document including data from an ongoing process using a condensed abstract representation of a search term density distribution, as taught and claimed by the present invention. As taught in the specification on page 16 lines 1-18, markers represent the frequency with

which search terms occur in the portion of the document represented by that marker, using relative darkness, color, and patterns for example to represent different densities. Koike presents no search term density information, only small tick marks to indicate that at least one instance of a search term occurred - a user must navigate and explore further to extract the information directly represented by the present invention.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3 and 15 are rejected as unpatentable over Koike in view of Chen. Claim 11 is rejected as unpatentable over Koike in view of Ahlberg. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected as unpatentable over Koike in view of Yeo. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected as unpatentable over Koike in view of Harvey. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, based on the remarks above regarding Koike and the remarks below. Ahlberg teaches an index slider (see Fig. 5) having a granularity proportional to the speed of mouse movements. Ahlberg's invention could be used as "a control panel for a medical image retrieval system..." (page 366 column 3), but neither teaches nor suggests the use of the summary view and search term density distribution for medical applications as described in the present application, even if combined with Koike. Yeo teaches a system for browsing video according to content and structure, but does not describe dynamic documents nor discuss data from security systems at all. Harvey teaches a chat room interface including avatars for participants, but this reference does not appear to be relevant to the operation of the present invention as it again is not related to depiction of search term density distribution. Thus, Koike and the cited references do not, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed features of the present invention.

All pending claims are believed to be allowable as amended. The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been carefully considered. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative if a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Dieberger et al.

By Marc D. McSwain
Marc D. McSwain (#44,929)
Phone (408) 927-3364